

REMARKS

Claims 22-44 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1-21 have been canceled. Claim 22 is based on previous claim 1 with rewording. The term "operation mode" has been replaced by "status", as supported by the description at page 2, line 3. The term "upper apparatus" has been replaced by "client terminal" for clarity, as supported by the description at lines 6 and 7 of page 13, and as shown in Fig. 2 for example. The term "discriminating information" has been replaced by "status update information" for clarity, as supported by the description at page 14, lines 4 to 8 ("status information updating frame formed by the discrimination information obtaining unit"). The function of the "display control information" has been included in the claim, as supported from page 13, line 22 to page 14, line 8 of the description, so that its role in the method can be clearly understood. The step of displaying status information under the control of the display control information has also been added to the claim, as supported by the description throughout, in order to emphasize the purpose of the display control information, and to assist with providing the distinction of the claims over the prior art as discussed below. For consistency with these amendments, new claim 22 is now directed to a method of controlling the display of a status, rather than to a notification method.

The claims as a whole have been amended so as to clarify the flows of data between the client terminal and the data processing apparatus. It is now clear that a "status request" (formerly "obtaining request of the operation modes") is sent from the client terminal to the data processing apparatus which in return transmits status update information to the client terminal, together with display control information. The status update information is displayed in accordance with the display control information. The display control information is stored by the client terminal and is used to control the display of new status update information received in response to a new status request. It is therefore only necessary to transmit the display control information to the client terminal once, in response to the first status request, which reduces network traffic.

New claims 23 and 24 are generally based on former claims 4 and 5 respectively, with rewording for consistency with new claim 22. In particular, new claim 24 has been worded in terms of method steps rather than features of the information, in order to clarify the role of the identification data. New claim 25 is based on the feature of former claim 8 that "discriminating

information is shown by each ID name added to each of the display information" with clarifying amendments. New claim 26 is based on the feature of former claim 6 that the "display control information includes image information", with the correspondence to the statuses being implicit from the purpose of the display control information. New claim 27 is based on the feature of former claim 7 that the "data processing apparatus holds discriminating information". The claim has been reworded for consistency with new claim 22. New claim 28 is based on former claim 2 with rewording. New claim 30 is based on the feature of former claim 10 that the "upper apparatus holds the received discriminating information", with rewording. New claims 30-32 are based on former claims 11 to 13 with rewording. New claim 33 is based on the feature of former claim 7 that the data processing apparatus is an "image forming apparatus". New claims 34 and 35 are supported by the description at page 16, lines 10 to 26. New independent claims 36 and 37 are based on former claims 14 and 15 respectively, and have been amended consistently with claim 22. New claims 38-40 are based on former claims 17 to 19 respectively, with rewording. New claims 40-44 are apparatus equivalents of new method claims 5, 12, 13 and 14 respectively.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 5 and 19 because of the informalities. Applicant has canceled claims 5 and 19 thus rendering the objections moot. .

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.. Applicant has canceled claims 7 and 14 thus rendering the §112 rejections of claims 7 and 14 moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0036793 A1 to Roosen *et al.* ("Roosen").

Roosen is directed to a system of workstations WS and printers PR connected by a local network N. Each printer includes an information server IS intended to receive from and send digital information such as status information concerning the printer and the print jobs that the printer is processing. Each workstation desktop software 100 includes a virtual printer (VP) which communicates with printers and updates the status of the printers insofar as the preferences of the user. The virtual printer software includes a user interface (UI) for interfacing to a user.

Fig. 3 of Roosen shows a window 10 which displays for each printer, a symbol indicating a status of that printer. A user can select one of the symbols and display the properties and status of the selected printer or call up a monitor function which during the work, gives information on the display screen concerning the status of the concerned printer. The user may also set preferences in the workstation virtual printer software for the form of the presentation (display) of the printer status data, either to select by permanent icon or messages that appear on the screen at the time that a change in printer status occurs. However, of most importance, the preferences selected by the user do not affect what information is transmitted from the attached printer to the workstation.

New claim 22 recites:

22. *A method of controlling the display on a client terminal (30) of the status of a data processing apparatus (10) connected to the client terminal (30) via a network (20) comprising:*

providing a status request to the data processing apparatus (10);

transmitting display control information to the client terminal (30) for controlling the display of statuses of the data processing apparatus (10) by the client terminal (30);

transmitting status update information to the client terminal (30); and

displaying the updated status in accordance with the display control information;

the method further comprising storing the display control information at the client terminal (30), and, in response to a subsequent status request, transmitting status update information and displaying the updated status in accordance with the stored display control information.

An embodiment of the claimed invention, provides the status information of a data processing apparatus connected to a client terminal. The status information is sent from the data processing apparatus upon a request from the client terminal. The first time that a request for status information is made, the data processing apparatus includes in its response, information for controlling the display of the status information along with the status information. The information for controlling the display of the status information received from the data processing device is stored in the client terminal. On subsequent requests for status information to the same data processing device, only updated status information corresponding to the information controlling the display is transmitted from the data processing apparatus to the client terminal. Advantageously, because only updated status information corresponding to the display control information is transmitted from the printer to the client computer network traffic is reduced.

Roosen does not teach, suggest or disclose, transmitting display control information from a data processing device to a client terminal, nor does Roosen store the display control information received from the display processing device in the client terminal for use in displaying updated status.

In contrast to the method recited in claim 22, Roosen merely provides the user of the workstation with options for the display of status information. The preferences input from the user are stored in the workstation and are not transmitted to a connected printer to be transmitted back to the workstation when status is first requested. Consequently, because the attached printer devices are not cognizant of the information that the user wishes to display, all of the status information available from the printer is transmitted to the workstation each time the status information is updated.

In view of the foregoing differences in the way Roosen transmits status information from the data processing device to the client computer compared to that recited in claim 22, Applicant

respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 as it may be applied to new claim 22.

Claims 23-35 depend from allowable claim 22. Accordingly, claims 23-35 are allowable based at least on their dependency from claim 22.

Claims 36 and 37 are allowable for the same reasons that claim 22 is allowable. Further, claims 38-44 are allowable based at least on their dependency from allowable claim 37.

Conclusion

Insofar as the Examiner's objections and rejections have been fully addressed, the instant application, including claims 22-44 is in condition for allowance and Notice of Allowability of claims 22-44 is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KENGO OCHI

11/14/08

(Date)

Richard A. Walker Reg. No. 39879

for **LOUIS SICKLES, II**

Registration No. 45,803

PANITCH SCHWARZE BELISARIO & NADEL LLP

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street, Suite 2200

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013

Telephone: 215-965-1330

Direct Dial: 215-965-1294

Facsimile: 215-965-1331

E-Mail: lsickles@panitchlaw.com